DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 496 08 CE 009 415

AUTHOR Bice, Juanita W.
TITLE A State Inservice Training Model for Local Directors of Vocational Education.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. Dept. of Vocational-Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO 498AH50286
PUB DATE Dec 76
GRANT G00-75-0047
NOTE 93p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; Demonstration Projects; Educational Research; *Inservice Education; Job Skills; Models; Post Secondary Education; *Professional Training; Program Development; Secondary Education; *Skill Development; Staff Improvement; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Directors; *Vocational Education; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

To meet the needs of the State of Tennessee and the people involved in the administration of local vocational programs, an inservice training program for local vocational administrators was developed. The basic approach to the project centered on the extern concept. Major components of the program included a summer conference, regional and statewide group meetings, individual instruction and assistance, and evaluation. Inservice participants were 15 potential directors or present directors of vocational programs who had been in the position for less than three years. Members (15) of the control group were selected from the statewide group of local directors of vocational education who had three or more years of experience in the position. Pre- and posttest instruments were used to measure changes in the 15 experimental group participants and 15 members of the control group. To assess the impact of the training program the Nonequivalent Control Group Design was used. The results indicated there were significant differences in gain scores in which the experimental group was higher. Nearly all of the participants' individual objectives which they identified in the summer workshop were completed during the program. The conclusions indicated that (1) competencies of participants were measurable and did improve for the experimental group, (2) it is possible for participants to identify their own competency needs and use them to formulate a professional development strategy to develop effective local administrators, and (3) the organized, planned extern program is a valuable activity for the new and emerging administrator. (Author/HD)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED137496

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 498AH50286
Grant No. G00-75-00447

A STATE INSERVICE TRAINING MODEL FOR LOCAL DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Melvin D. Miller, Project Director and Head
Department of Vocational-Technical Education
College of Education
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Juanita W. Bice, Project Coordinator

December 1976

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education
Public Law 90-576--Part C

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 009 415

ABSTRACT

Purpose

To meet the needs of the State of Tennessee and the people involved in the administration of local vocational programs, an inservice training program for local vocational administrators was developed.

Objectives

The objectives of the project included the following:

1. to provide a competency based inservice education program for local directors of vocational education charged with the responsibility for the development of comprehensive vocational programs;

2. to identify from previously researched competencies for local vocational education leaders, those which represent areas of greatest need for leadership at the local level in Tennessee; and,

3. to research the level of competency development of program participants and those of local directors who have been in the position for four or more years.

Methodology

The basic approach to the project centered on the Extern concept (Courtney, Miller and Andersson, 1974). Major components of the program included a summer conference, regional and statewide group meetings, individual instruction and assistance, and evaluation.

Pre/posttest instruments were utilized to measure changes in the fifteen experimental group participants and fifteen members of the control group. To assess the impact of the training program the Nonequivalent Control Group Design was used.

Results

There were significant differences in gain scores on the Miller-Courtnes Competency instrument in which the experimental group was higher.

Nearly all of the participants' individual objectives which they identified in the summer workshop were completed during the program. Strengths of the program that emerged from the evaluation were:

1. the sharing of ideas and problem solutions among participants;

2. the visits to various locations and types of agencies and facilities;

3. the individual assistance and contact with the university staff; and,

4. the materials provided.

The weaknesses identified were:

1. the days away from the local system;

2. not enough sharing with experienced local directors.

The personal gains identified by the participants included:

1. an increased appreciation and understanding of the relationship between university staff, state department personnel, and the local administrators which lowered the "frustration level" through personal contact and their willingness to be of service;

2. improved self-concept, improved working habits and ability to make decisions;

3. increased self-confidence in ability to plan, administrate, and manage programs for the students; and,

4. impetus to continue professional development.

Conclusions

1. Competencies of participants were measurable and did improve for the experimental group based on the Miller-Courtney Competency Instrument.

2. It is possible for participants to identify their own competency needs and use them to formulate a professional development strategy to develop effective local administrators.

3. The organized, planned extern program is a valuable activity for the new and emerging administrator.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Project Director and the Project Coordinator which to express appreciation to Dr. Roger W. Haskell, Professor, Industrial Education, and Dr. Donald E. McNelly, Assistant Professor, Distributive Education, staff members of the University of Tennessee, who served as Regional Coordinators and provided assistance and instruction to the participants throughout the project. We are also indebted to Dr. McNelly and Dennis Phillips, Graduate Assistant, for assistance in data processing.

Special thanks to the following persons who graciously provided time, support, and assistance to the project: personnel in the State Division of Vocational Education, Nashville; the local superintendents of the project participants; the local directors who served as members of the control group; and finally, the participants in the project who willingly gave of their time and efforts in order to be able to provide improved programs for students in vocational education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives	2
Related Studies	2
METHODOLOGY	4
Selection of Project Staff and Participants	4
Individual Needs Assessment	5
Developmental Activities	6
Training Materials Collected and Developed	7
Data Collection	8
FINDINGS	10
Results of the Competency Assessment	10
Attitudinal Change Assessment	11
Philosophical Viewpoints Assessment	19
Summer Workshop Evaluation	20
Individual Objectives	22
Accomplishment of Individual Objectives	25
Formative Evaluation	27
Summative Evaluation	28
Graduate Credit	31
CONCLUSIONS	32
RECOMMENDATIONS	34
ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY	36
APPENDIXES	38
A. Workshop Program	38
B. Pretest and Posttest Mean Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups on the Miller-Courtney Leadership Test	43
C. Workshop Objectives and Evaluation Form	60
D. Program Evaluation Form	63

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Mean Scores of Control and Experimental Groups on the Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale	12
2.	Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale D for Pretests and Posttests of Control Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale.	13
3.	Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups Of Individuals on Sub-Scale K for Pretest and Posttests of Control Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale.	14
4.	Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale R for Pretests and Posttests of Control Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale	15
5.	Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale D for Pretests and Posttests of Experimental Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale	16
6.	Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale K for Pretests and Posttests of Experimental Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale	17
7.	Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale R for Pretests and Posttests of Experimental Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale	18
8.	Group Mean Scores on Inventory of Viewpoints on Education	
9.	Mean Scores, Standard Deviation & Standard Scores on Pre and Posttests for Experimental and Control Groups on Personal Orientation Inventory	21
10.	Degree of Success in Accomplishing Objectives of Summer Workshop Based on a 5-point Likert-type Scale	23
11.	Number of Objectives Identified and Degree of Accomplishment by Participants	26

INTRODUCTION

The quality of administration of local programs in vocational education is a key element in determining whether or not learners will be provided with multiple opportunities to obtain their goals in life and in providing trained personnel to meet the manpower needs. As employment in education expands and broadens, public schools are facing greater demands in attracting and maintaining personnel who are competent to provide effective leadership for these programs. In many instances, schools have solved the problem of providing local leadership by identifying persons on the local staff to assume these responsibilities. Hopefully, these persons are as adaptable to change as must be the program with which they are working.

It is necessary to insure that local administrators have the competencies to utilize the extensive information available regarding student needs, manpower information, and state and community resource data in the implementation and expansion of vocational education programs at the local level. They must have the competency to coordinate the vocational programs with the many facts of the local community, to be sensitive to new and emerging occupations, and to insure articulated programs with other agencies providing similar or advanced vocational education training. The local administrator or director must utilize these competencies to plan, initiate, manage, and evaluate vocational education programs which are effective in meeting learner needs and goals which embody the philosophical concepts that represent vocational education.

Recent legislation passed by the Tennessee State Legislature Assembly provided for greatly expanded construction of vocational education facilities at the local level. The goal of the Legislature was to make vocational education available to a minimum of fifty percent of the state's secondary school students and create a delivery system in vocational education for adult learners in every community of the state. With the facilities completed or under construction and local plans approved, it becomes the responsibility of the local administration to realize the potential inherent in the State Legislative Assembly's action. With a persistent shortage of personnel at the local level who were fully qualified to meet the demands of those local administrators, there was a need to initiate a project drawing on past research and resulting in the development of alternative administrative strategies for maximizing the resources available to local agencies. Therefore, to meet the needs of the state and the people involved in the administration of local vocational programs, the development

of an in-service training program for local directors of vocation education was implemented.

Objectives

The objectives of the project included the following:

1. to provide a competency based in-service education program for local directors of vocational education charged with the responsibility for the development of comprehensive vocational programs;

2. to identify from previously researched competencies for local vocational education leaders, those which represent areas of greatest need for leadership at the local level in Tennessee; and

3. to research the level of competency development of program participants and those of local directors who have been in place for four or more years.

Specific benefits expected for local directors who participated in the project included the development of competencies:

1. to develop local programs in coordination and cooperation with business, industry, and community organizations;

2. to develop planning and management skills for application at the local level;

3. to develop a plan for articulation of vocational programs within the local educational agency and with post-secondary institutions; and

4. to utilize the state's management information services in local program planning.

Related Studies and Background

The Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit developed a statewide management information system which has the capability of providing massive as well as finite information that should be considered in the development and operation of local vocational education programs. The potential of the management information system is yet to be fully realized. There is little question that the newly-developed yet under-utilized resource will play an important role in the administration of local vocational programs.

A number of comprehensive research studies (Baltimore, 1972; Heilman, 1970; Martin, 1972; Sundstorm, 1972; and Ward, 1971) have been conducted to identify competencies which are pertinent to the needs of local vocational education administrators at both the secondary and post-secondary levels. As a result of these studies a competency pre/posttest has been developed (Miller and Courtney, 1974). These studies together with the pre/posttest instrument provide a meaningful basis for establishing leadership development programs and assessing individual's competencies in relationship to such programs. The preservice training program in occupational education and administration conducted by Southern Illinois University (Ramp, 1974) provides another valuable resource for establishing and conducting a research-oriented training program for local administrators. The competency-based activities utilized in this project have a great similarity to the competencies identified in the previously mentioned research studies and provide a further validation and clustering arrangement of the competencies.

In the past, regionalized efforts have been conducted to strengthen leadership roles in vocational education (Ten Pas, 1969 and Worthington, 1970). The institutes, however, have not limited their scope to local leadership competencies. Other regional and national institutes were oriented toward specific areas or concerns of vocational education but were not limited to local leadership needs, (Blake, 1972; Colorado State University, 1972; Arkansas University, 1971). Other than the Extern program conducted in Oregon and duplicated in Arkansas, there appears to be relatively little attention given to an in-depth in-service program for local administrators of vocational education (Miller, 1972).

METHODOLOGY

The basic approach to the project centered on the Extern concept (Courtney, Miller and Anderson, 1974). Certain principles have evolved out of the Extern experience which served as guides in the development and implementation of the program. The principles are:

1. A long-range plan of in-service education needs must be established.

2. In-service training is a cooperative effort of the individual, local educational agency, state agency and teacher education.

3. In-service education involves setting individual participant and group goals.

4. Each participant in an in-service program produces a product as a part of the implementation phase of in-service.

5. In-service instruction is designed to provide instruction over an extended period and includes an implementation phase.

6. An evaluation plan is provided as an integral part of in-service education.

7. University credit is available at the option of the participant.

The total strategy was to incorporate these principles into the program. Major components of the program include a summer conference, regional and statewide group meetings, individual instruction and assistance, and evaluation.

Selection of Project Staff and Participants

The project planning committee met early in May to begin the activities of the program. The committee included representatives of the Department of Vocational-Technical Education and the Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit. The Project staff was established and consisted of:

Dr. Melvin D. Miller
Dr. Juanita Wallace Bice
Dr. Roger W. Haskell
Dr. Don E. McNelly

To identify the project participants, local superintendents were requested to nominate the present director or potential director of their vocational programs if he/she had been in the position for less than three years. The planning committee and project staff selected the participants from names submitted and divided them into three geographical regions with a coordinator assigned to work alternately within each region. The final group included 18 participants, five each from the west and middle Tennessee regions with eight from the east region; the group included fourteen males and four females. Fifteen participants completed the program. Three males did not complete the program due to health, personal and professional commitments, and change of position.

The members of the control group were selected from the statewide group of local directors of vocational education who had three or more years of experience in the position. Fifteen persons in the control group completed the pretest and posttest phases of the assessment.

Individual Needs Assessment

The formal program began with a summer workshop (Appendix A--Workshop Program), on the University of Tennessee, Knoxville campus. The objectives and accomplishments of the workshop were as follows:

Objective 1. To complete a needs assessment

The needs assessment was accomplished through a series of pretests, including the Miller-Courtney (1974) Competency Test. The process resulted in a self-identification of skills most necessary for exercising leadership roles and self-rating of all competencies included in the test form. Competency needs which emerged most frequently were utilized in establishing group and individual objectives and in the selection and development of instructional materials and strategies.

Three additional instruments were administered: (1) A Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale which measures attitude; (2) an Inventory of Viewpoints on Education which measures a progressivist-essentialist philosophical position; and (3) the Personal Orientation Inventory.

The analysis of the instruments provided a basis for working with the individuals and for comparison at the conclusion of the program to

determine the effect of the Extern program on the attitudes and philosophical positions of the participants.

Objective 2. To develop a group identity

Presentations and small group activities on communication and management skills provided the formal approach to accomplish the objective. In addition, planned informal activities stimulated the establishment of close working relationships among the project staff and Extern participants.

Objective 3. To identify group and individual objectives

The feedback from the Miller-Courtney Competency Test provided the basis for establishing the group and individual objectives. Each Extern developed a list of individual objectives to be accomplished during the project for use by staff in providing individual assistance and instruction.

Objective 4. To develop a schedule of activities and meetings

The participants met in regional groups to determine common competencies needed. Based on these competencies, the participants planned monthly regional meetings. Each Extern was responsible for planning at least one of the meetings for his/her region. A schedule of meetings by region was developed and submitted, listing the topic, resource persons, meeting place and date, and the Extern chairing the meeting.

evelopmental Activities

Developmental activities following the workshop consisted of two major components, group activities and individual instruction and assistance. Group activities involved a variety of strategies, including visitations to outstanding comprehensive vocational programs at the secondary and post-secondary level; visitations to business, industry, and community organizations; rap sessions on group visits; lectures and seminars on topics related to leadership roles and important elements in the planning, implementation and management of successful comprehensive vocational education programs at the secondary level; and involvement with state and regional leaders of vocational education.

There were ten meetings scheduled throughout the year on a monthly basis--six regional and four total group. The project coordinator and two regional coordinators met on a rotating basis with the various regional meetings. As part of the leadership development phase of the program, each participant had the responsibility of arranging for and chairing at least one regional meeting. The total group meetings were coordinated by project staff.

The second component, individualized instruction and assistance, was provided each participant at his local agency. During the workshop, each participant developed personal objectives for implementing, expanding and improving vocational education in his/her agency. The individual's objectives were based on the needs assessment and became the basis for the individual assistance provided by a project coordinator on the average of once each month. Progress reports from the visit of the previous month were also used by project staff in follow-up visits.

Since local plans include an emphasis on coordinating and cooperating with local business and industry, each participant was strongly encouraged to establish an advisory council for vocational education with representatives from all segments of industry. The development of the local plan and its related goals and objectives was accomplished with cooperation from the advisory council.

Training Materials Collected and Developed

Curriculum guides and instructional materials for new teachers and programs were areas of major concern for the local director participants. Materials were obtained by participants from several regional curriculum laboratories and other educational institutions and agencies, including the Center for Vocational Education at the Ohio State University, the Texas Instructional Materials Laboratory and the Oklahoma State Curriculum Laboratory.

The Research Coordinating Unit of each state was contacted by project staff to identify and obtain copies of available current state-developed materials relative to curriculum guides for vocational programs, handbooks for advisory councils, handbooks for vocational teachers, public relations methods and procedures, and adult vocational education program planning and implementation. The materials received from the various RCU's were made available during the regional meetings.

The various services of the Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit located on the University of Tennessee,

Knoxville campus were made available and utilized by the participants. The information, materials, and personal assistance provided the participants by the RCU aided in the developmental and operational program planning efforts of the local vocational education programs.

The accomplishment of objectives identified by the individual participants resulted in the development of materials which were shared within the group. The materials developed included Advisory Council Handbooks, Handbook on Safety in the Shop, Handbook for Vocational Teachers, Directory of Vocational Education for Adult Evening Classes, brochures on program offerings, public relations plans, supply and equipment management systems, placement and follow-up programs, slide/tape presentations of vocational programs, and in-service training programs.

Data Collection

To evaluate the effect of the program the following data were collected:

1. Pre/posttest scores of three instruments from participants and control group
   a. Miller-Courtney Leadership Competency Test --142 items
   b. Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale --92 items
   c. Inventory on Viewpoints of Education --65 items
   d. Personal Orientation Inventory--150 items
2. An evaluation of the summer workshop
3. A list of individual objectives to be accomplished during the year submitted at the conclusion of the summer workshop by each participant.
4. Written evaluations from each participant describing accomplishment of objectives.
5. Identification of participants and members of control group who had functioning Advisory Councils in August, 1975 and in June, 1976.
6. Formative evaluation by participants through informal feedback and input during the year.

7. Written and oral summative evaluation by participants at the conclusion of the program.

8. Graduate credit was available to the participants at his/her option.

The pre/posttest instruments were utilized to measure changes in the participants. To assess the impact of the in-service training program the Nonequivalent Control Group Design (Huck, Cormier and Bounds, 1974) was used. The treatment of the data involved an independent samples "t" test on the gain scores for the two groups on the four instruments.

FINDINGS

Results of the Competency Assessment

The competency test used for the assessment was the 142-item instrument, the Miller-Courtney Leadership Competency Test, which utilized a five-point Likert-Type scale. Each item represented a competency which had been previously validated through occupational analysis as being important to the job of a vocational leader. The participants (local directors of vocational education programs) were asked to assign a scale value to each of the items (competencies) according to his or her perception of their ability to perform the competency. The instrument was administered twice to each group, experimental and control, by the project coordinator, once as a pretest in August, 1975, and again as a posttest in June, 1976. The "t" tests were used to make the following comparisons; (1) the two groups with respect to pretest performance; (2) the two groups with regard to posttest scores (independent samples "t"); and (3) the pretest and posttest scores of the control group (related samples "t"). The assumption of equal variances was tested.

Appendix B reveals the following findings:

1. Raw mean scores on the pretests of the two groups indicated:

   --the control group had a higher score on 133 of the 142 items and were significantly higher at the .05 level on 34 of the 142 items;

   --the experimental group was higher on 4 of 142 items (no significant difference);

   --the groups were the same on 5 of the 142 items.

2. The posttest scores of the two groups indicated:

   --the experimental group mean scores were higher than the control group on 61 of the 142 items, significantly higher at the .05 level on 3 of the items;

   --the control group mean scores were higher than the experimental group on 69 items (no significant difference); and

3. The posttest scores of the experimental group showed:

   --an increase over the mean score of the pretests on 115 of the 142 items and were significantly higher at the .05 level on 9 of the items;

   --a decrease on 17 items; and

   --they were the same on 10 items.

4. The posttest scores of the control group when compared with the pretest scores revealed:

   --higher scores on 37 of the 142 items;

   --lower scores on 88 items, significantly lower at the .05 level on 3 of the items; and

   --remained the same on 17 items.

The "t" tests comparing pretest and posttest scores indicate some significant changes between and among the groups; however, Guilford (1975) stated that the significant or non-significant differences may not necessarily be attributed to the treatment, or program. To determine more specifically the effect of the program additional analysis of the data was made utilizing "gain scores", which were obtained by subtracting, for each subject on each item, the pretest score from the posttest score. Mean gain scores were calculated for each of the two groups and the independent samples "t" test was used to compare the two groups. The gain scores of the experimental group were significantly higher at the .05 level on 28 items. There were no statistically significant differences on the other 114 items.

Attitudinal Change Assessment

The Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale was used to describe the nature of change and the factors associated with change. The results of the pretest and posttest are shown in Table 1. The mean gain scores were calculated for each of the two groups. There were no significant differences on the gain scores on any of the three subscales, D,K, or R.

Table 1. Mean Scores of Control and Experimental Groups on the Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale

Group	Mean Scale Scores*					
	Sub-Scale D (Open-Mindedness)		Sub-Scale K (Supportiveness)		Sub-Scale R (Flexibility)	
	Pretest Scores	Posttest Scores	Pretest Scores	Posttest Scores	Pretest Scores	Posttest Scores
Control	141.6	148.7	13.3	12.5	94.9	98.9
Experimental	141.2	145.9	15.1	13.5	91.3	91.7

*Note: An increase in value on the "K" scale is indicative of greater supportiveness of others. Decreases on the "R" and "D" scales are interpreted as being more flexible and more open-minded, respectively.

The D-scale mean scores reflect a slight difference between the groups on the pretest (control group = 141.6; experimental group = 141.2) and on the posttest (control group = 148.7; experimental group = 145.9). The experimental group was slightly more open-minded (lower score = more open-mindedness) than the control group on both the pretest and posttest; however, the mean scores of both groups indicated slightly less open-mindedness on the posttests.

The K-scale mean scores indicate that the experimental group was the more supportive (higher score = more supportive) of the groups on the pretest (experimental = 15.1; control = 13.3) and on the posttest (experimental = 13.5; control = 12.5). The scores of both the experimental and control groups reflect a decline in supportiveness on the posttest.

The R-scale mean scores indicate that the experimental group was more flexible (lower score = more flexibility) than the control group on the pretest (E = 91.3; C = 94.9) and on the posttest (E = 91.7; C = 98.9). Both groups were slightly less flexible at the end of the year.

Examination of the mean scores for the three sub-scales indicated minor shifts in the data. Examination of individual scores reflected more substantial shifts. The distribution patterns for individuals of both groups on each sub scale are indicated in Tables 2 through 7.

Table 2. Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale D for Pretests and Posttests of Control Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale

Group[1]	Control Member	Sub-Scale D Open-Mindedness	
		Pretest Score[2,3]	Posttest Score[2,3]
I	3	167	157
	5	189	170
	11	135	77
	14	186	132
	15	174	156
II	1	170	198
	2	106	129
	4	131	147
	6	112	133
	7	101	161
	8	141	158
	9	137	145
	10	87	156
	12	146	156
	13	142	155

[2]Decrease in score = more open-minded

[3]Increase in score = less open-minded

[1]Note: Group I scores reflect changes in control group members which were more open-minded; Group II scores reflect less open-mindedness at the end of the program as indicated by posttests results.

Table 3. Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale K, for Pretests and Posttests of Control Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale

Group[1]	Control Member	Sub-Scale K Supportiveness	
		Pretest Score[2,3]	Posttest Score[2,3]
I	2	18	19
	3	13	13
	4	15	18
	7	15	15
	8	11	12
	10	17	19
	12	9	9
		[2]Increase in score = more supportive	
II	1	9	7
	5	12	11
	6	14	9
	9	19	18
	11	14	13
	13	11	10
	14	11	7
	15	12	8
		[3]Decrease in score = less supportive	

[1]Note: Group I scores reflect changes in control group members which were more supportive; Group II scores reflect less supportiveness at the end of the program as indicated by posttest results.

Table 4. Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale R for Pretests and Posttests of Control Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale

Group[1]	Control Member	Sub-Scale R Flexibility	
		Pretest Score[2,3]	Posttest Score[2,3]
I	2	104	82
	3	104	97
	5	89	81
	9	79	78
	11	87	80
	13	98	97
		[2]Decrease in score = more flexible	
II	1	107	113
	4	95	97
	6	99	100
	7	100	117
	8	75	108
	10	88	97
	12	88	102
	14	118	142
	15	92	93
		[3]Increase in score = less flexible	

[1]Note: Group I scores reflect changes in control group members which were more flexible; Group II scores reflect less flexibility at the end of the program as indicated by posttest results.

Table 5. Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale D for Pretests and Posttests of Experimental Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale.

Group[1]	Exp'l Group Member	Sub-Scale D Open-Mindedness	
		Pretest Score[2,3]	Posttest Score[2,3]
I	3	163	112
	7	162	140
	8	141	121
	10	163	162
		[2]Decrease in score = more open-minded	
II	1	121	179
	2	135	145
	4	141	164
	5	104	114
	6	166	169
	9	145	151
	11	100	111
	12	156	172
	13	136	143
	14	147	149
	15	138	156
		[3]Increase in score = less open-minded	

[1]Note: Group I scores reflect changes in participants which were more open-minded; Group II scores reflect less open-mindedness at the end of the program as indicated by posttest results.

Table 6. Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale K for Pretests and Posttests of Experimental Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale

Group[1]	Exp'l Group Member	Sub-Scale K Supportiveness	
		Pretest Score[2,3]	Posttest Score[2,3]
I	2	13	19
	3	15	18
	7	11	16
	10	8	10
	13	14	14
		[2]Increase in score = more supportive	
II	1	16	14
	4	15	9
	5	16	12
	6	11	7
	8	24	18
	9	17	12
	11	23	20
	12	11	7
	14	16	15
	15	16	11
		[3]Decrease in score = less supportive	

[1]Note: Group I scores reflect changes in participants which were more supportive; Group II scores reflect less supportiveness at the end of the program as indicated by posttest results.

Table 7. Distribution Patterns of High and Low Groups of Individuals on Sub-Scale R for Pretests and Posttests of Experimental Group on Dogmatism-Supportiveness-Flexibility Scale

Group[1]	Exp'l Group Member	Sub-Scale R Flexibility	
		Pretest Score[2,3]	Posttest Score[2,3]
I	2	91	85
	3	95	82
	6	100	99
	7	113	8
	9	92	85
	10	105	97
	12	96	90
	13	91	74
		[2]Decrease in score = more flexible	
II	1	105	113
	4	82	111
	5	83	91
	8	73	81
	11	71	75
	14	83	95
	15	89	109
		[3]Increase in score = less flexible	

[1]Note: Group I scores reflect changes in participants which were more flexible; Group II scores reflect less flexibility at the end of the program as indicated by posttest results.

Philosophical Viewpoints Assessment

The philosophical viewpoints assessment utilized an inventory which places the viewpoints of individuals on an "essentialist-progressive" scale in terms of sixty-five paired educational philosophy statements. The Inventory of Viewpoints on Education produces s res from 0 - 65. The zero score indicates that the person is a "perfectly consistent essentialist." The score of 65 represents the response of a person with a progressive philosophy in all situations.

In terms of the two philosophical positions, the essentialist is characterized as being content oriented in the foundation of objectives and experience. The progressive position is learner (student) oriented. The methods and evaluation practices of essentialists are principle-organized. The progressives are student interest and problem-oriented.

The results of the testing patterns of the two groups are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Group Mean Scores on Inventory of Viewpoints on Education

Group	Group Mean Scores*	
	Pretest	Posttest
Control	42.7	43.7
Experimental	45.7	45.0

*Note: A score of 65 indicates perfect agreement with the "progressive" philosophy while a score of 0 indicates a perfect agreement with the "essentialist" philosophy. A "progressive" person relates to what is going on today, activities are based upon society and how it is developing, and the curriculum is student centered. An "essentialist" reflects a never-change philosophy, mastery of fundamentals, and a content-centered curriculum.

The data indicate that the experimental group was more progressive than the control group at the beginning and at the conclusion of the project. The statistical analysis of the gain scores using the independent samples "t" test showed no difference in scores at the .05 level of significance.

The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was used to assess the comparative value and behavior judgements of a person related to their self-actualization. Fourteen

sub-scales are generated by the P.O.I, each of them representing various aspects of self-actualization. The items are first scored for two basic scales of personal orientation, inner-directed support and time competence.

A time competent person is one who lives primarily in the present with full awareness, contact, and full feeling reactivity. He or she is able to tie the past and the future to the present in meaningful continuity. "Inner-directed" individuals are guided primarily by internalized principles and motivations rather than through peer or other external influences.

The scales are interpreted in ratio scores. The Time Ratio scores on the pre and posttests for the experimental group were within the normal range for self-actualizing individuals. The Time Ratio score for the control group and the Support Ratio scores for both groups on pretest and posttests were slightly below the normal range.

The second scoring is for ten sub-scales each of which measures a conceptually important element of self-actualization, i.e. valuing, feeling, self-perception, synergistic awareness and interpersonal sensitivity.

Detailed profiles of pretest and posttest results were plotted for each participant of the experimental group and each member of the control group. The Profile Sheet available for the P.O.I. was constructed from adult norms. Raw scores, when plotted, can automatically be converted to standard scores. On the Profile Sheet the mean standard score is 50, with a standard deviation of 10.[1]

The standard scores on the sub-scales for the experimental group ranged between 44 and 55 on both the pretest and posttest. The standard scores for the control group ranged between 41 and 49 with the exception of one sub-scale which had a standard score of 54. Statistical analysis of the data using the "t" test revealed no significant differences in the gain scores. See Table 9.

Summer Workshop Evaluation

At the concluding meeting of the workshop each participant was requested to indicate on a 5-point Likert-type scale the degree to which each of the activities on the

---

[1]Shostrom, Everett L., Personal Orientation Inventory Manual: An Inventory for the Measurement of Self-Actualization. Educational and Industrial Testing Service, San Diego, Calif., 1966.

Table 9. Mean Scores, Standard Deviation & Standard Scores on Pre and Posttests for Experimental and Control Groups on Personal Orientation Inventory

POI Scale	Experimental Group[1] Pretest Mean	SD[1]	SS[3]	Posttest Mean	SD[1]	SS[3]	Control Group[1] Pretest Mean	SD[1]	SS[3]	Posttest Mean	SD[1]	SS[3]
Time Competent	18.1*	2.1	52.0	17.6	2.1	49.5	16.1*	2.6	44.5	16.3	2.4	45.5
Inner Directed	85.6*	8.7	49.5	83.9	11.4	48.0	77.9*	8.0	44.5	80.7	8.1	46.0
Self-Actualizing Value	21.4*	2.7	53.5	21.1	2.8	53.0	20.0*	3.0	49.5	20.1	2.8	49.5
Existentiality	19.9*	4.3	46.0	19.1	4.1	44.0	17.1*	2.8	41.0	17.9	4.1	42.0
Feeling Reactivity	14.7	2.2	47.0	14.3	2.6	46.5	13.9	2.9	45.0	14.3	2.4	46.0
Spontaneity	12.6	1.7	53.5	12.3	2.8	52.0	11.5	2.7	47.0	11.2	2.8	45.5
Self-Regard	13.3*	1.5	55.0	13.3	1.7	54.0	13.2*	1.7	54.0	13.3	2.3	54.0
Self-Acceptance	16.7*	2.7	49.0	16.4	3.8	48.5	14.5*	2.9	44.0	14.9	3.1	45.0
Nature of Man, Constructive	12.1*	1.9	49.0	12.0	1.8	48.0	11.7*	1.4	46.0	12.2	1.4	49.0
Synergy	7.7*	0.7	53.0	7.6	0.6	52.0	6.8*	1.2	46.4	7.3	1.1	50.0
Acceptance of Agression	15.1	3.9	45.0	18.1	4.7	49.0	14.9	2.9	46.0	14.6	3.1	44.0
Capacity for Intimate Control	18.33	3.3	50.0	18.3	4.9	49.0	17.0	3.2	46.0	17.3	3.5	47.0

*Significantly greater at .05 level (pre to pre)

[1]No significant differences on gain scores between the groups
[2]SD = Standard Deviation
[3]SS = Standard Score for Profile Sheet

program (Appendix A) accomplished the specified objectives (Appendix C). A summary of the responses are presented in Table 10.

The mean response by the group on 11 of the 16 activities was 4.7 or higher. These 11 activities were very specifically related to all objectives.

Subjective remarks by respondents on Activity 13 indicated that the low rating was based on the presenter's personality and lack of definitive information regarding his topic of a pending career education proposal.

Comments by participants of the workshop included the following:

"The program is just what I need-- a chance to solve problems in job knowledge and ability, and, at the same time, grow professionally and gain toward attainment of personal goals."

"The week was well planned and well implemented, facilities were appropriate, fantastic staff...excited about the year.

Individual Objectives

Each participant identified and submitted a list of individual objectives to be accomplished during the year. The objectives were based on the areas of weakness identified by the competency test preassessment results and from "felt" needs of the individual. Typical objectives included the following:

To improve publicity for adult programs

To improve the curriculum and instruction in Adult Building trades

To develop and implement a scheduling program for Vocational Center and 6 feeder high schools

To develop public relations programs to inform the public regarding the need for adequate financial support

To develop and present a slide/tape presentation for feeder high school on programs to be offered at Center

To ascertain the kinds and types of adult programs to be offered at the Vocational Center

Table 10. Degree of Success in Accomplishing Objectives of Summer Workshop Based on a 5-point Likert-type Scale

	Activity	Mean Response
1.	Welcome to Campus	4.3[1]
2.	Orientation	4.7[2]
3.	Needs Assessment/Small Groups	4.8[2]
4.	Group Picnic	4.8
5.	Field Services of State Department	4.3[1]
6.	Vocational Legislation	4.8[2]
7.	Dissemination Services of RCU	4.7
8.	Utilization of RCU - "Hands On" Activity	4.9
9.	Faculty Convocation - Committee of Education	2.8[1]
10.	Communication Skill Building	4.9
11.	Management Decision Making	4.9
12.	Management Information System	4.9
13.	State Career Education Mini-Grant Project	3.8
14.	Needs Assessment/Goal Identification	3.8[2]
15.	Competency-Based Teacher Education Project	4.2
16.	Determining Goals and Objectives	4.8[2]

[1]Activities perceived by some respondents as not specifically related to accomplishment of objective but good information to have.

[2]Activities presented by project staff.

To develop a plan for pre-vocational education

To develop in-service training programs for teachers

To set objectives for each teacher and program for school year

To up-grade instructional materials

To make advisory and craft committees more active in programs

To implement an effective placement and follow-up program

To set up an effective equipment and supply management system

To develop a handbook for vocational teachers

To develop an evaluation plan for career education K-6

To encourage staff members, principals and counselors in the improvement of high school curriculum to meet today's needs

To implement and integrate career education into the academic curriculum of grades K-8

To work toward establishing continuous harmony and understanding between the public and the school

To plan, organize and execute a city-wide professional growth program for elementary, junior high and senior high school teachers in the system

To plan, organize, implement and articulate a staff development program for career education staff including pre-school workshop and monthly training sessions during academic year

To plan, organize and write proposals for career education funds

To secure from state, regional and local resources the equipment, supplies and reference materials for the instructional areas of the Center

To develop a process of student identification for vocational programs

To make an orderly transition of the vocational school for the handicapped to the "mainstreaming" concept

To develop a handbook and program to inform students of new vocational offerings at four comprehensive high schools

To establish an effective, meaningful program in vocational education for the EMR student enrolled in high school

To aid teachers in developing quality instructional programs to better prepare students for job placement

To improve management of time and resources through implementation of management procedures

To increase professional competency through development of research skills and proposal writing

To improve understanding of political forces and other agencies affecting or relating to vocational education

Accomplishment of Individual Objectives

Each participant evaluated his/her progress toward the accomplishment of each objective by describing the procedure or method used and the end result or product. The number of objectives identified and accomplished by participants is illustrated in Table 11. Fifteen participants identified a total of 75 objectives. The number of objectives per participant ranged from 2-9. Fifty-eight of the objectives (77%) were completed, fourteen (19%) were in progress. Three of the objectives were not completed due to the unavailability of local funds and/or local physical facilities limitations.

As part of the initially proposed project, a major objective of each participant was to organize and utilize a functioning advisory council for vocational education within his/her local system. At the outset of the program August, 1975, six of the 15 participants (40%) had a functioning advisory council in their system. The participants who had no council or had one in name only, set as an objective to develop a council. At the conclusion of the program all (100%) participants reported success or progress in this objective.

Twelve of the fifteen participants (80%) reported a functioning council. The other 3 participants reported that a council had been identified and approved through the local

Table 11. Number of Objectives Identified and Degree of Accomplishment by Participants

Participants	Total Number of Objectives	Number of Objectives Accomplished	Number of Objectives in Progress	Number of Objectives Not Able to Accomplish
1	9	7	1	1
2	3	3		
3	6	6		
4	4	4		
5	7	5	2	
6	8	6	2	
7	4	4		
8	4	1	2	1
9	4	4		
10	2	2		
11	6		6	
12	3	3		
13	6	6		
14	6	5	1	
15	3	2		1
Total	75	58	14	3

education system and that a date had been set for a first meeting of the council.

The reports from members of the control group revealed that 6 of the 15 (40%) had an advisory council in August, 1975. The number and percentage of councils remained the same for the control group at the end of the project period.

Other objectives were reported by participants as having been accomplished through development of some of the following products or activities:

Collection, evaluation, and adoption of curriuclum materials form various sources, i. e., The Center for Vocational-Techincal Education, at Ohio, Texas Instructional Materials Laboratory, Oklahoma State Curriculum Laboratory, Oregon State University, and others.

Public relations plans including releases and interviews to various news media as well as presentations to local agencies.

Scheduling programs for new vocational centers and "feeder" schools

Slide/tape presentations to be used for student and public orientation to vocational education

Planning and scheduling of adult vocational education programs

Proposals for funding in career education

In-service training programs for vocational and career education offerings

Several handbooks including:
- Advisory Council handbooks
- Handbooks on Shop Safety
- Handbook for Vocational Teachers

Formative Evaluation

At the monthly regional meetings participants were occasionally requested to respond orally or in writing to informal evaluation questions. The responses indicated general satisfaction with the procedures and activities. Input from the comments resulted in streamlining program activities and occasionally modifying a program objective to accommodate more specifically the needs of the group.

Additional formative evaluation and/or input was obtained through the monthly on-site visits of the university project staff with the "extern" and through a conference with the local superintendent during these visits. Both the "extern" and the superintendent described the progress being made on the individual's local goals and made suggestions or requests on how the staff could provide more assistance. Progress toward meeting objectives was shared with all project staff members in a memo following the meeting. The requests for assistance were followed-up by the appropriate staff person. Specific comments and/or suggestions from the superintendents were reported to the Head of the Department for his information and/or action.

The project staff met periodically throughout the year to review activities, subjectively assess progress toward the project objectives, and adjust schedules and activities when necessary.

Summative Evaluation

At the end of the project each participant completed a Program Evaluation form (Appendix D) which contained a list of objectives of the project and the specific benefits expected. The participants responded in writing to the following six open-ended questions:

1. What specifically do you consider to be the strong points of the program which helped you to meet the objectives of the program as well as your own specific objectives?

2. What specifically do you consider the weaknesses of the program?

3. What specific suggestions would you offer for the improvement of the program next year?

4. How has the overall program been of benefit in the development and writing of your local plan?

5. Did you have an advisory council in August, 1975? Do you have an advisory council in June, 1976? Is it a functioning council?

6. Have sufficient materials and/or information been made available to you? What suggestions do you have for improvement in this area?

The subjective responses of the participants to the questions were of a positive nature and were summarized in the following statements:

1. The major strengths that emerged were:

   a. the sharing of ideas and problem solutions among the participants;
   b. the visits to various locations and types of agencies and facilities;
   c. the individual assistance and contact with university staff;
   d. the materials provided.

2. The major weaknesses were:

   a. the days away from local system;
   b. not enough sharing with experienced local directors.

3. Suggestions for program improvement were:

   a. to provide more opportunities for sharing ideas and problems with experienced directors;
   b. to plan more individual time with participants (longer visits);
   c. to keep meetings on Friday and Saturday;
   d. do not have evening meetings;
   e. to involve state personnel in small group meetings;
   f. to schedule major trips early in the program;
   g. to include superintendents and principals in some group meetings;
   h. to provide more resource people.

4. The program benefited the participants in developing and writing the local plan in the following areas:

   a. providing clear and concise plans for organizing the advisory committee and its involvement in the local plan;
   b. developing objectives and long-range plans and discussing them with local administrators;
   c. gaining better understanding of the need for and relationship of parts of the local plan.

5. In August, 1975, the participants reported six functioning advisory committees. In June, 1976, twelve of the fifteen participants reported active advisory committees; the other three participants reported that committees had been appointed and a date for the first meeting was set.

6. All participants responded enthusiastically and affirmatively in response to the availability of sufficient materials and information.

In the final program meeting each participant shared with the group a brief report of his or her major accomplishments during the year, personal or intangible gains from the program, and identified one or two major objectives for the 1976-77 school year. The major accomplishments shared were a repeat or summary of the objectives which had been accomplished and discussed previously in the report.

The personal, or intangible, gains were similar among the group members.

The gains reported most frequently were as follows:

--an increased appreciation and a greater understanding of the relationship between University staff, State Department of Education personnel, and local administration which lowered the "frustration level" through the personal contact with these people and their willingness to be of service

--adjusted attitude in the change from being a classroom teacher to becoming an administrator

--the close professional relationships developed only through a program such as this one

--improved self-concept and ability to be more forceful and assertive

--assistance from the university staff as a resource supplying information, guidance, and literature

--increased self-confidence in ability to plan, administrate, and manage programs for the students, to work more effectively and efficiently with all levels of personnel, and to "keep going when the going gets tough"

--the impetus to continue professional development through a degree program at the university

--contacts with business and industry in various locations across the state as a planned activity in program meetings

--an understanding and appreciation of the Research Coordinating Unit and the ability to use its services

--improved work habits such as planning and using time

--ability to make decisions and abide by them

Objectives outlined by participants for the 1976-77 school year includes the following:

--to use the advisory council in program planning

--to implement or expand adult vocational programs

--to coordinate program for guidance counselors

--to conduct Placement and Follow Up Study

--to complete work on masters of Doctoral degree

--to have a reunion of the program participants during the year.

Graduate Credit

Graduate credit for the program was available at the option and cost of the individual. Fourteen of the fifteen participants registered for 9-15 quarter hours or a total of 162 credit hours. Some participants completed additional vocational coursework which was offered in off-campus classes in their vicinity.

CONCLUSIONS

At first it would appear that the program was not effective based on the direction of the test scores. Upon further analysis and interpretation of all available data and information perhaps the program did help the participants in several specific areas. Therefore, it can be concluded that:

1. The kinds of attitudes and/or competencies that the project tried to develop either were not accomplished or were not measurable by the data collection instruments used with the exception of the Miller-Courtney Competency Test.

2. Among the experimental group, the program did improve the competencies that were identified on the Miller-Courtney instrument.

3. The competency level of the participants improved but based on the results of the other tests, it might be concluded that this process has a detrimental effect. It caused the other results to go negative but maybe something else should be built into the process in order to keep this from occurring.

4. Even though the scores on the other instruments were not statistically different there was enough change to reveal that something was responsible during the time of the project to cause the experimental group participants to become more dogmatic. This is not necessarily undesirable. It could have been because of a more rapid maturation process in terms of being a local administrator. They became more like the administrators in the control group.

5. It is possible for a group of people participating in an extern program to identify their own competency needs which can then be used to formulate a professional development strategy to develop effective local administrators.

6. The organized extern program does have some effect upon how participants think and might react administratively.

7. Based on the subjective evaluation by the participants one could conclude with a high degree of certainty that the organized, planned extern program was an extremely valuable activity for the new and emerging administrator. However, it can't be concluded exactly which component of the extern program was the most valuable. On the other

hand the day to day experiences and observations of the project staff reveal that probably the most important aspect of the program was the "rap session" held during each regional meeting. In the informal setting the participants apparently felt comfortable discussing the seminar topic, the special program or agency which had been visited, and seeking answers to specific problems. Through the sharing of problems and solutions to problems they built a working relationship which was used between meetings.

8. A positive attitude by the participants toward university and state department personnel is a result of the close working relationship developed during the program as they provide guidance and assistance throughout the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the experiences and process of the project the following recommendations are made:

1. That further study be given to identifying and documenting specific extern-type activities that are most valuable to the participants.

2. That the extern program be expanded to include perhaps a two-year program for beginning local administrators. Because of the committments and personal adjustments they have to make during the first year in a position, they may not be able to develop a well-planned inservice program.

3. That an effort be made to prioritize competencies but more important to sequence the priorities into an organized training program.

4. That the extern program include, as participants, the local administrators who have been in the field for sometime in order to update and reacquaint them with evolving roles and philosophies of vocational education. They may also serve as valuable resource persons.

5. That the extern program administrator work very closely with the State Director of Vocational Education to identify new directions and emphases (objectives) of vocational education in the state. The state program objectives should then be built into the training program and into individual objectives.

6. During the summer workshop or very early in the extern program a thorough and complete analysis of the current condition and expected directions of vocational education in the state be given in order that participants may more intelligently identify competencies needed for the future rather than just what is needed in the present.

7. That a study be made of the role that personal characteristics and personality take in local administration.

8. In order to continue fostering the idea of personal development and improvement graduate credit should continue to be given for the extern program. It is recommended that the extern concept itself be recognized and be given graduate credit thereby eliminating the need to give extern credit through other courses.

ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS

1. Rotating project staff for the regional meetings and monthly individual visits appeared to be of benefit to the participants. The rotation allowed the groups and individuals contact with these university staff persons who offered various areas of expertise.

2. The regional meeting concept allowed for smaller more functional and more manageable groups. The best ratio is two to three meetings of the total group to four or five regional meetings per group. The statewide meetings allowed project staff to make outside resource persons available to everyone and provide the opportunity for interaction with all participants.

3. The summer workshop is essential for orienting participants to the program, establishing group identity, assessing needs, and identifying objectives and activities for the program during the year.

4. It is ideal if the project budget can support participant travel but is also effective if the local agency provides the support. Financial support by the LEA indicates its committment and involvement in the program.

5. Outside resources should be made available periodically and at appropriate times throughout the program. This provides flexibility and assistance when needed and offers expertise which may not be available in project staff.

6. Written and verbal evaluation by the participants reveal that they each gained more self-confidence and assurance of their ability to perform as an administrator.

7. The enthusiasm of the participants may mean that even though they were more close-minded, it helped them focus more on their problems and gather more information and ideas to help them better do their job and to sort out some of the things they need to be doing and not be doing.

8. The unique circumstances of the funding by the state legislative assembly and/or the establishing of new programs late in 1975 or for the 1975-76 school year may have had a large impact on both the control and experimental group.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arkansas University, Fayettville, College of Education. Institute for Improving Vocational Education Evaluation. Final Report. Summer 1971. VT 012 305, Ed 045 839.

Baltimore, Jimmy R. 1972. A Study of Professional Education Competencies of Public School District Vocational Education Leaders. Ed.D. Thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University.

Blake, Duane L. and Dale G. Gutcher. New Vocational Education Concepts and Programs in Metropolitan Areas. Final Report. 1972. VT 014 113, ED 056 202.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and CO., 1972.

Colorado State University, Department of Vocational Education, Metropolitan Area Application of Vocational Education Innovations Resulting From Research and Development Programs. Final Report. 1972. VT 014 111, ED 055 248

Courtney, E. Wayne, Melvin Miller and Jaquelyn Andersson. 1974. Summary Report Vocational Leadership Development Program. Corvallis, Oregon State University.

Heilman, Casmer F. 1970. A Task Analysis of Selected Leaders in Vocational Education. Ed.D. Thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University.

Huck, Schuyler W., et al. Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Huston, Denver B. 1972. Arkansas Extension Program. Fayetteville, University of Arkansas.

Martin, Dariel D. 1972. A Study of Professional Education Competencies and Community College Administrators of Vocational Education. Ed.D. Thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University.

Miller, Melvin D. 1972. Review and Synthesis of Research on Preparation of Leadership Personnel for Vocational and Technical Education. Columbus, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University.

Miller, Melvin D. and E. Wayne Courtney. 1974. Vocational Leadership Competency Test (Product). Corvallis, Oregon State University. Unpublished paper.

Ramp, Wayne S. 1974. The Implementation of a Model Competency Based Graduate Program in Occupational Education Administration. Phase III. Carbondale, Southern Illinois University.

Shostrom, Everett L. EITS Manual for the Personal Orientation Inventory. Educational and Industrial Testing Service, 1966.

Sundstrom, Lloyd. 1972. Professional Competencies of Selected Administration of Vocational Education. Ed.D. Thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University.

Ten Pas, Henry A. 1969. A Leadership Development Institute for Vocational and Technical Education Personnel in the Western States. Washington D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Ward, Darrell L. 1971. Vocational Education Competencies Identified for Local Leaders of Occupational Education. Ed.D. Thesis. Corvallis, Oregon State University.

Worthington, Robert M. 1970. Vocational Education Leadership Training Institute. Trenton, New Jersey, State Department of Education.

Appendix A

Workshop Program

A STATE INSERVICE TRAINING MODEL
FOR LOCAL DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

EXTERN PROGRAM
USOE Grant No. GOO-75-00447

Presidential Court Complex
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

August 11-15, 1975

PROGRAM

Monday, August 11

8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	First Session, Dr. Juanita Bice, Chairman
	Topic: Needs Assessment
	Dr. Don McNelly, Teacher-Educator Department of Vo-Tech Ed The University of Tennessee
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.	BREAK
10:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon	Welcome
	Dr. James D. McComas, Dean College of Education The University of Tennessee
	Topic: Orientation
	Dr. Melvin D. Miller, Head Department of Vo-Tech Ed The University of Tennessee
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.	LUNCH
1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Second Session
	Topic: Needs Assessment (Small Group Sessions)
	Dr. Juanita Bice, Project Coordinator Dr. Don McNelly
3:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.	BREAK
3:15 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.	Topic: Registration
	Dr. Melvin D. Miller
6:00 p.m.	Group Evening Meal

Tuesday, August 12

8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Third Session	
	Topic:	Vocational Field Services
		Mr. David Jared, Director Field Services, Division of Vocational Education State Department of Education
	Topic:	Vocational Legislation - Implications for Vocational and Career Education
		Dr. Melvin D. Miller
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.	BREAK	
10:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon	Topic:	Services of Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit
		Mrs. Dee Wilder Information Specialist Tennessee RCU
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.	LUNCH	
1:00 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	Topic:	Services of TRCU continued (Visit to RCU)
2:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	BREAK	
3:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.	Topic:	College of Education Convocation
		Dr. Sam Ingram, Commissioner of Education
		Room 101 Claxton Education Building

Wednesday, August 13

8:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon	Fifth Session Topic: Communication and Management Decision Making Dr. Larry Hughes, Professor Department of Educational Administration and Supervision University of Tennessee
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.	LUNCH
1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.	Continuation of Morning Topic

Thursday, August 14

8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Sixth Session
	Topic: Local Plans for Vocational Education/Management Information System
	Dr. Garry R. Bice, Director Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.	BREAK
10:15 a.m. - 12:00 noon	Continuation of Above Topic
12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m.	LUNCH
1:00 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	Seventh Session
	Topic: Career Education
	Dr. Charles Graves State Division of Vocational Education Nashville, Tennessee
	Topic: Role of the Chamber of Commerce in Career Education (video-tape)
	Mr. Thomas Walsh, Executive Director National Chamber of Commerce
2:30 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	BREAK
2:45 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.	Topic: Needs Assessment
	Dr. Juanita Bice and Dr. Don McNelly

Friday, August 15

8:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon — Eighth Session

Topic: Competency Based Teacher Education

Dr. Jack Stallard & Dr. David Craig
Teacher Educators
Department of Vo-Tech Ed
The University of Tennessee

Topic: Determining Goals and Objectives

Dr. Juanita Bice and Dr. Don McNelly

12:00 noon - 1:00 p.m. — LUNCH

Topic: Future Directions in Tennessee Vocational Education

Mr. Jonah Fitch
Assistant Commissioner for
Vocational-Technical Education
Nashville, Tennessee

1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. — Ninth Session

Goals and Objectives, continued

(Individual and Group Reports)

Appendix E

Pretest and Posttest Mean Scores
of the Experimental and Control Groups
on the Miller/Courtney Leadership
Competency Test

Appendix B

Pretest and Posttest Mean Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups on the Miller-Courtney Leadership Competency Test

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
1. Identify problems or obstacles which hinder the achievement of occupational education program goals.	3.33	3.87[2]	3.93	3.80[2]
2. Conduct follow-up studies of former vocational education students.	3.73	4.07[2]	4.67	4.33[2]
3. Collect, analyze and apply labor market and employment data in curricula selection and development.	3.20	3.13	3.60	3.53
4. Conduct community and occupational surveys.	3.80	4.00	4.27	4.00
5. Break down an occupation or job into its component parts for instructional and guidance purposes.	3.53	3.60	3.80	4.00
6. Interpret the state specifications for occupational education facilities.	3.00	3.60	3.93	3.93
7. Collect data and complete reports for local, state, and federal government sectors regarding the vocational educational program.	3.20	3.73	4.13	4.33

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
8. Critically analyze and interpret advisory committee recommendations to determine the need for a given occupational program.	3.33	3.80[2]	4.00	4.13[2]
9. Determine the need for additional staff.	4.27	4.27	4.20	4.27
10. Define the various statistital terms which are used in research design.	2.27	2.40	3.07	2.80
11. Determine the competencies expected of the classroom teacher in a vocational education curriculum.	3.67	4.20	3.80	3.87
12. Identify the activities and resources required to attain curriculum goals.	3.40	3.67[2]	3.73	3.73[2]
13. Establish general vocational program objectives for the school.	3.80	4.40[1]	4.20	4.20
14. Critically analyze an occupational survey of the district.	3.07	3.33	3.80	3.67
15. Specify the data needed for the inputs to the instructional systems such as characteristics of entering students.	2.93	3.60	3.33	3.47

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
16. Design a feedback and follow-up system to provide evaluation data to the instructional staff.	2.87	3.07	3.47	3.33
17. Determine the product measures to be used in evaluating programs.	2.80	3.07	3.53	3.33
18. Determine the need for new programs.	3.73	4.07	4.00	4.07
19. Develop an evaluation system for an instructional program.	3.13	3.60	3.73	3.40
20. Devise a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of an educational program.	3.07	3.53	3.27	3.40
21. Write performance-oriented objectives.	3.40	3.53[2]	3.33	3.53[2]
22. Identify a researchable problem.	3.00	3.27	3.73	3.27
23. Isolate modes which correspond to best use of organizational resources.	2.47	2.67	3.00	2.87
24. Identify sets of scales which are ordinal, nominal, and equidistant interval.	2.00	2.40	2.47	2.27

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
25. Coordinate project proposal writing.	2.87	2.87	3.27	3.13
26. Describe the use of correlation techniques as they are applied to statistical analysis.	2.00	2.80[1]	2.73	2.47
27. Identify the needs of disadvantaged group in the community.	3.53	2.67	3.93	4.00
28. Use the ERIC system and other library reference sources to locate research data.	2.93	3.60[1]	3.53	3.07
29. Describe how the Dictionary of Occupational Titles may be utilized to determine classification, job title, job levels, and duties for a variety of occupations.	3.60	3.87	3.67	3.60
30. Develop criteria for the identification of disadvantaged students.	3.13	3.60	3.60	3.53
31. Describe the rise of statistical clustering techniques which are commonly utilized in occupational analysis.	2.20	2.53	2.93	2.73
32. Contribute to studies, commissions, and investigations sponsored by professional organizations and governmental agencies.	3.13	3.00	3.60	3.33

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
33. Locate and use community resources in program planning and evaluation.	4.07	3.87	4.13	3.87
34. Prepare budgets and effect fiscal operating controls.	3.73	3.73	4.07	4.00
35. Interpret financial and special needs of occupational educational curricula.	3.33	3.80	4.07	3.80
36. Prepare proposals and reports related to the approval and funding of on-going programs of occupational education.	3.73	3.80	4.40	4.00
37. Utilize school budgeting and cost control accounting procedures in program operation.	3.27	3.80	3.93	4.00
38. Determine priorities as they relate to the allocation of institutional resources.	3.67	3.87	3.80	3.93
39. Allocate resources to maximize the output of the instructional system.	3.27	3.47	3.93	3.80
40. Describe the use of significance test as applied to statistical analysis.	2.13	2.80[1]	2.87	2.87

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
41. Prepare a project proposal for funding based on State Department of Education format.	3.07	3.33	3.87	3.67
42. Assist in school contract negotiations.	3.40	3.73	3.93	4.00
43. Assist in the development of a program, planning, and budgeting system for a school.	3.53	3.87	4.07	4.13
44. Determine the cost-effectiveness of programs.	2.93	3.13	3.47	3.60
45. Interpret the results of correlation analyses.	2.67	2.87	3.07	2.80
46. Work with the educational administration to initiate and maintain occupational education programs.	3.67	3.73	4.13	4.27
47. Organize and use local occupational education advisory committees.	3.93	4.13	4.20	4.47
48. Relate the occupational education instruction program to other areas of the school curricula.	3.87	4.13[2]	4.00	4.07[2]
49. Identify and interpret community labor market and student needs into meaningful educational programs.	3.47	3.73	3.87	3.87

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
50. Develop and/or direct the development of occupational education curricula.	3.33	3.73	3.47	3.67
51. Promote unity and balance between vocational and general education.	4.00	4.07[2]	4.27	3.80[1 2]
52. Plan courses of study and curricula for occupational education programs.	3.60	4.00	3.87	3.87
53. Secure appropriate on-the-job training positions for students.	4.07	4.27	4.07	4.33
54. Promote, organize and conduct adult occupational educational programs.	4.00	4.20	3.93	4.20
55. Relate technological advances to laboratory and class instruction.	3.87	3.47	3.93	3.67
56. Establish minimum standards and criteria for the selection and approval of training stations in cooperative programs.	3.73	3.87[2]	3.67	3.60[2]

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
57. Utilize evaluation data in decisions related to curriculum development and revision and improvement of instruction.	3.33	3.60	3.87	3.73
58. Approve new instructional materials.	3.67	3.93	3.93	3.87
59. Determine the appropriateness of a particular way of assessing a learning problem.	3.20	3.40	3.73	3.40
60. Determine the measures to be used in evaluating the instructional processes, such as student-teacher interactions.	3.47	3.53	3.80	3.73
61. Interpret the results of statistical significance testing.	2.60	2.87	2.80	2.80
62. Provide leadership to youth organizations stemming from the vocational program.	4.20	4.20	4.13	4.20
63. Facilitate the development of vocational education programs to satisfy the needs of the disadvantaged.	3.87	4.00	3.87	3.87
64. Describe how occupational analysis may be used to develop objectives, content and methods for developing curricula.	3.27	2.93	3.53	3.67

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
65. Write instructional objectives to include performance, standards, and conditions at a selected level of the cognitive domain.	3.07	3.00[2]	3.40	3.33[2]
66. Write instructional objectives to include performance, standards, and conditions at a selected level of the psychomotor domain.	2.87	2.87	3.27	3.13
67. Write instructional objectives to include performance, standards, and conditions at a selected level of the affective domain.	3.07	3.07[2]	3.47	3.27[2]
68. Suggest minimal program changes to increase the success of disadvantaged and handicapped students in ongoing vocational programs.	3.53	3.73	3.80	3.73
69. Specify outcomes for a career awareness program.	3.67	3.80	4.07	3.67
70. Specify outcomes for a career exploration program.	3.60	3.87	3.87	3.73
71. Specify in general terms the expected outcomes for an occupational cluster preparation program.	3.27	3.67	4.07	3.60

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
72. Provide courses that are responsive to the individual learning rates of students.	3.53	3.87	3.67	3.73
73. Conduct evaluations of vocational education programs.	3.67	3.93	4.13	4.07[2]
74. Develop criteria for and evaluate facitities and equipment needs of occupational preparatory programs.	3.40	3.73	3.93	3.73
75. Evaluate staff load and balance.	3.73	4.13	4.20	4.13
76. Determine the measures to be used in evaluating the instructional processes, such as the effectiveness of instructional strategies.	3.00	3.20[2]	3.47	3.47[2]
77. Identify constraints within an organization.	3.27	3.53	3.67	3.40
78. Determine the optimum use of educational resources.	3.60	3.73	3.60	3.73
79. Assess the validity and reliability of data.	2.67	3.13	3.27	3.13
80. Be aware of social changes which might influence new systems design.	3.40	3.60	3.73	3.47

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group[1]		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
81. Develop a survey instrument, including letters of transmittal and follow-up.	3.27	3.73	4.00	3.60
82. Be aware of social changes which might influence new systems design.	3.53	3.67	3.80	3.47
83. Describe a plan for sampling a cross-section of a population.	3.07	3.33	3.53	3.13
84. Establish and maintain effective working relationships with trade, labor management, agricultural and manpower organizations.	4.00	4.00	3.73	4.07
85. Interpret the vocational program to teachers, parents, students and the community.	4.13	4.47	4.47	4.40
86. Effectively express yourself both orally and in writing.	3.80	3.93	4.20	3.87
87. Utilize the services of federal, state and local agencies responsible for occupational education.	3.67	3.93	4 33	3.93
88. Utilize federal, state and local vocational education legislation.	3.53	3.87	4.00	4.13

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
89. Provide information to students concerning the nature and requirements of occupations.	4.00	4.20	4.13	4.13
90. Write a research proposal which includes an accounting of the objectives, design, and management strategy elements.	2.60	2.87	3.73	3.27
91. Identify job opportunities and assist in placement of students graduating from occupational preparatory programs.	3.80	4.00	4.13	3.87
92. Select appropriate statistical designs which are used in educational research.	2.27	2.27	2.87	2.87
93. Identify, recruit and counsel students for placement in occupational preparatory programs.	3.47	4.07[2]	4.07	3.87[2]
94. Formulate a personal philosophy of education/vocational education.	3.73	4.13	4.20	4.13
95. Conduct a meeting involving members in the discussion.	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.33
96. Articulate the program with other educational levels and the business/industrial community.	3.87	4.00[2]	4.00	3.93[2]

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
97. Schedule courses.	4.33	4.20	4.40	4.07
98. Interpret the principles and philosophy of vocational education.	3.73	4.13[2]	4.27	4.20[2]
99. Plan meeting agendas, arrange for facilities and materials, and notify participants.	4.33	4.47	4.33	4.33
100. Define the mission of the school.	4.20	4.40	4.47	4.13
101. Direct demonstration and pilot projects for examplary programs.	3.20	3.53	3.80	3.60
102. Develop and direct a program to improve public relations between the school and the community.	3.87	3.93	4.20	3.87
103. Develop a rationale for a particular curriculum plan built upon the technological, sociological, philosophical, and psychological bases.	3.20	3.13[2]	3.33	3.27[2]
104. Interpret financial and special needs of vocational education to the public and to the community served.	3.40	3.87[2]	3.93	3.93[2]

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
105. Identify the tools and techniques of public relations.	3.73	3.67[2]	4.00	3.93[2]
106. Discuss the biases associated with sampling.	2.73	2.93	3.47	3.33
107. Develop long-range goals.	3.67	3.93[2]	4.13	3.87[2]
108. Appoint committees.	4.20	4.20[2]	4.07	4.13[2]
109. Write instructions for committee members.	3.93	3.87[2]	4.13	3.93[2]
110. Develop short-range goals.	4.00	4.13[2]	4.33	3.80[1 2]
111. Describe the various types of research procedures available for the evaluation of educational practices.	2.40	2.47	3.13	2.80
112. Make decisions based upon empirical evidence.	3.13	2.93[2]	3.60	3.40[2]
113. Be skilled in information and communication.	3.40	3.67[2]	3.73	3.67[2]
114. Develop new organizational patterns.	3.27	3.33	3.87	3.47
115. Address such problems as decentralization of administrative responsibility instruction and its impact on programs.	3.13	2.93	3.60	3.40

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
116. Know the elements of decision theory.	1.36	1.10	3.47	3.40
117. Manage by objectives.	3.33	3.53	4.00	3.73
118. Isolate and define required decisions.	3.40	3.27[2]	4.13	3.47[1 2]
119. Be aware of technological changes which might influence new systems designs.	3.33	3.27	3.73	3.27
120. Indicate alternate modes of operation for a school program.	3.40	3.33	3.73	3.47
121. Write letters of transmittal.	3.80	4.00	4.13	4.0
122. Develop a career development plan for disadvantaged students.	3.40	3.87	3.67	3.47
123. Establish a job placement program for vocational students.	3.93	4.00	4.13	4.00
124. Make an oral or written presentation on the relationship of education, career education and vocational education.	3.67	4.13	3.93	3.93
125. Write a rationale based on established theories to support the career awareness and exploratory concepts in career education.	3.27	3.40	3.67	3.60

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
126. Develop various communication channels, both formal and informal.	3.73	3.80	3.87	3.80
127. Plan and organize for the division of work among staff members.	3.93	4.00[2]	4.00	4.00[2]
128. Plan for the control process in administrative action.	3.13	3.33	3.80	3.33
129. Use the statistical interactive programming computer systems (SIPS) to solve statistical problems.	1.67	1.67	2.60	2.27
130. Render judgmental decisions involving ethical values.	3.33	3.60	3.47	3.73
131. Develop job specifications and select teaching and leadership personnel for occupational education.	3.27	3.67[1 2]	3.93	3.87[2]
132. Evaluate the performance of teachers.	4.00	4.13	4.00	4.00
133. Coordinate the activities of the occupational education staff.	3.93	4.22	3.87	4.00
134. Organize and conduct inservice seminars and workshops for teachers and other staff members in occupational education.	3.47	4.07[1]	4.00	4.00

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).
[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix B Continued

Competency Description	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean
135. Determine the appropriateness of a particular way of assessing a staff member.	3.4	3.6	3.60	4.00
136. Organize an inservice plan on the functions, purposes and activities on an advisory committee for presentation to the vocational staff.	3.4	3.93	3.87	3.93
137. Utilize information contained in professional journals for self-employment.	3.87	3.93[2]	3.80	4.00[2]
138. Write job descriptions.	3.47	4.07[1]	3.87	3.93
139. Concur in retention or dismissal decisions.	3.60	4.13[1]	3.93	3.87
140. Facilitate the development of an inservice program to prepare teachers to meet the needs of the disadvantaged.	3.47	3.87	3.67	3.80
141. Recruit and develop personnel.	3.87	4.13	3.87	4.00
142. Reconcile conflicting points of view between individuals and groups.	3.53	3.60	3.93	3.53

[1]Significant difference at .05 level within groups (pretest to posttest).

[2]Significant difference at .05 level on "gain scores" between experimental and control groups.

Appendix C

Objectives of the Workshop
and
Workshop Evaluation Form

A STATE INSERVICE TRAINING MODEL
FOR LOCAL DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

EVALUATION

Workshop -- August 11 - 15, 1975

The objectives of the workshop are as follow:

1. To orient the participants to the Extern program.

2. To assess the needs of the individuals.

3. To develop group identity.

4. To identify objectives for:

   a. the total group
   b. each regional group
   c. each participant

5. To schedule meetings and tentative activities for the program and to utilize simulation materials to gain further understanding and share in the long-range planning process.

Using the following scale, please indicate to what degree each of the activities and presentations met the objectives of the workshop.

Degree of success in accomplishing objectives:

5. High
4. Medium
3. Low
2. Unrelated to specific workshop objective but "nice to know" information
1. Unrelated

MONDAY

1. Dean James McComas
   Remarks and Welcome

2. Dr. Miller
   Orientation

3. Dr. McNelly/Bice
   Small group session
   Needs Assessment

4. Picnic

TUESDAY

5. Mr. Jared
   Field Services

6. Dr. Miller
   Vocational Legislation

7. Mrs. Dee Wilder
   Services of RCU Presentation

8. Mrs. Dee Wilder
   "Hands On" Activities--RCU

9. Dr. Sam Ingram
   Faculty Convocation--
   Education in Tennessee

WEDNESDAY

10. Dr. Larry Hughes
    Communication Skill Building (a.m.)

11. Dr. Larry Hughes
    Management Decision Making (p.m.)

THURSDAY

12. Dr. Garry Bice
    Management Information System

13. Dr. Charles Graves
    State Career Education Mini Grant Project

14. Dr. McNelly/Bice
    Needs Assessment Goal Identification

15. Dr. Craig/Stallard
    Competency-Based Teacher Education

16. Dr. McNelly/Bice
    Determining Goals & Objectives

APPENDIX D

Program Evaluation

STATE IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR
LOCAL DIRECTIORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

-"EXTERN PROGRAM - 1975 - 76"-

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Objectives to be developed through this project included the following:

1. To provide a competency based in-service education program for local directors of vocational education charged with the responsibility for the development of comprehensive vocational programs.

2. To identify from previously researched competencies for local vocational education leaders those which represent areas of greatest need for leadership at the local level in Tennessee.

3. To research the level of competency development of program participants and those of local directors who have been in place for four or more years.

Specific benefits expected for local directors who participated in this project include the development of competencies to:

1. develop local programs in coordination and cooperation with business, industry, and community organizations;

2. develop planning and management skills for application at the local level;

3. develop a plan for articulation of vocational programs within the local educational agency and with post-secondary institutions;

4. utilize the state's management information services in local program planning.

Please respond to the following questions on the attached sheets of paper.

1. What specifically do you consider to be the strong points of the program which helped you to meet the objectives of the program as well as your own specific goals?

2. What specifically do you consider the weaknesses of the program?

3. What specific suggestions would you offer for the improvement of the program this next year?

4. How has the overall program been of benefit in the development and writing of your local plan?

5. Did you have an advisory council in August, 1975?
Yes _____ No _____

Do you have an advisory council in June, 1976?
Yes _____ No _____

Is it a functioning committee?
Yes ___ No _____

6. Have sufficient materials and/or information been made available to you? What suggestions do you have for improvement in this area?